

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly define the invention.

This invention relates to a server apparatus which generates first and second analog signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals. Nowhere is the instant invention shown or suggested by the cited art, taken either singly or in combination.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 10 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naden WO 01/56297 in view of Hicks III et al US 2004/0255326 and Thomas et al US 5,920,801. The Applicants can not agree.

Naden relates to a home video distribution system in which signals from multiple satellite sources are distributed to multiple receivers. The Examiner agrees that Naden fails to disclose first and second analog signals having different encoding, as set forth in Claims 1,10 and 20. The Examiner finds this structure in Hicks III et al. The Applicants can not agree.

Hicks III et al. relates to a system which receives signals from antenna 11, dish 21, CATV and broadband data. The system processes these signals to obtain digital signals. See paragraph 0042. Nowhere does Hicks III et al. show or suggest:

"first processing means for generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing means for generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Rather, Hicks III et al. outputs only digital signals.

Thomas et al relates to a cable 3 which behaves as an antenna. Any radio transmission in the environment of the cable can cause interference. Thomas therefore determines frequency bands which are non-interfering. Nowhere does Thomas et al show or suggest:

"first processing means for generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing means for generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Nowhere does Thomas et al. have any discussion of different encodings of analog signals. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 1 is not affected by Naden, Hicks III et al and Thomas et al., taken either singly or in combination.

Similarly, nowhere do any of Naden, Hicks III et al and Thomas et al show or suggest:

"generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals"

as specifically recited in Claim 10 as amended. It is therefore clear that Naden, Hicks III et al and Thomas et al do not affect the patentability of Claim 10.

Similarly, nowhere do any of Naden, Hicks III et al and Thomas et al show or suggest:

"first processing elements operative to generate first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing elements operative to generate second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 20. It is therefore clear that Naden, Hicks III et al and Thomas et al do not affect the patentability of Claim 20.

The Examiner has additionally cited McCalley et al US 5,191,410, Harper et al US 5,537,141 and Dufour et al US 6,049,717 against subclaims of the instant application.

McCalley et al relates to a CATV cable arrangement that allows interactive communication. A subscriber enters data into a telephone network using a keypad. All data being sent to a subscriber is digital until a local presentation player converts the data to analog, in order to be compatible with a subscriber's television receiver. Nowhere does McCalley et al show or suggest:

"first processing means for generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing means for generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Rather, McCalley et al. outputs analog signals only in an encoding which is compatible with a subscriber's television receiver. It is therefore clear that McCalley et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Similarly, nowhere does McCalley et al show or suggest:

"generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals"

as specifically recited in Claim 10 as amended. It is therefore clear that McCalley et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 10 as amended.

Similarly, nowhere does McCalley et al show or suggest:

"first processing elements operative to generate first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing elements operative to generate second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 20. It is therefore clear that McCalley et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 20.

Harper et al relates to a remote learning system which uses multiple-choice questions. Each student answer, either correct or incorrect, generates a pre-recorded response. The student inputs his response by the use of a keypad and headphones. In an NTSC version, audio is inserted in a vertical blanking interval. Transmissions by the instructor may be composed and digitized. A local converter changes the data to analog for a local display. Nowhere does Harper et al show or suggest:

"first processing means for generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing means for generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Rather, Harper et al. outputs analog signals of only a single encoding. It is therefore clear that Harper et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 1 as amended.

Similarly, nowhere does Harper et al show or suggest:

"generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals"

as specifically recited in Claim 10 as amended. Rather, Harper et al only generates a single analog encoding. It is therefore clear that Harper et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 10 as amended.

Similarly, nowhere does Harper et al show or suggest:

"first processing elements operative to generate first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing elements operative to generate second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 20. Rather, Harper et al shows only a single analog encoding. It is therefore clear that Harper et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 20.

Dufour et al relates to an operator assisted cell phone system, in which the operator of the cell phone system may change the operating frequency to avoid interference. The operator may specify operation in digital, analog, or dual mode. Nowhere does Dufour et al show or suggest:

"first processing means for generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing means for generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Rather, Dufour et al outputs analog or digital or dual mode, but not analog signals having different encoding. It is therefore clear that Dufour et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 1 as amended.

Similarly, nowhere does Dufour et al show or suggest:

"generating first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

generating second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals"

as specifically recited in Claim 10 as amended. Rather, Dufour et al only generates analog signals having a single encoding. It is therefore clear that Dufour et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 10 as amended.

Similarly, nowhere does Dufour et al show or suggest:

"first processing elements operative to generate first analog signals responsive to said received signals;

second processing elements operative to generate second analog signals responsive to said received signals, wherein the first analog signals have a different encoding than the second analog signals",

as specifically recited in Claim 20. Rather, Dufour et al shows only a single analog encoding. It is therefore clear that Dufour et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 20.

The Applicants therefore submit that the patentability of the instant invention is not affected by the cited references, taken either singly or in combination. The Applicants therefore submit that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

No fee is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this amendment, other than the fee for an extension of the period for response. However if any additional fee is incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against deposit account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Anthony Pugel
Douglas Edward Lankford
John Joseph Curtis III
Keith Reynolds Wehmeyer
Mike Arthur Derrenberger
Terry Wayne Lockridge
Andrew Eric Bowyer

by_ / Daniel E. Sragow / ____
Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,856
609-734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 17092008